



**UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/049,219	01/17/2002	Bernard Danner	1999CH006	9387

25255 7590 03/31/2003

CLARIANT CORPORATION  
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT  
4000 MONROE ROAD  
CHARLOTTE, NC 28205

EXAMINER

KUMAR, PREETI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1751

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2003

6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Office Action Summary**

Applicati n No.

10/049,219

Applicant(s)

DANNER ET AL.

Examiner

Preeti Kumar

Art Unit

1751

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 January 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 18-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 18-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 18-34 are pending.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

2. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "or/and" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation(s) following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 1751

6. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

7. Claims 18-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Joyner et al. (US 4,483,969).

Joyner et al. teach emulsifiable polyester waxes which are linear polyester waxes which are end capped with polyfunctional organic anhydrides. The emulsifiable polyester waxes are generally amorphous or semicrystalline solids with melting points less than about 100.degree. C. These polyester waxes are useful in preparing clear emulsions which can be applied to surfaces to form protective and decorative films or coatings. See col.1, ln.1-10. Joyner et al. teach useful polyfunctional anhydrides include trimellitic anhydride, sulfobenzoic anhydride, phthalic anhydride, and the like. Suitable saturated aliphatic or cycloaliphatic dibasic acids include cis or trans 1,4-cyclohexanedicarboxylic, cis or trans 1,3-cyclohexanedicarboxylic, glutaric, adipic, pimelic, suberic, azelaic, sebacic, 1,12-dodecanedioic, dimer acid, and the like. Alkylated succinic anhydrides such as octylsuccinic, tetradecylsuccinic, octadecylsuccinic anhydride, and the like may also be used as a portion of the dibasic acid moiety. Suitable aliphatic or cycloaliphatic glycols are, for example, ethylene glycol,

Art Unit: 1751

1,3-propanediol, propylene glycol, 1,4-butanediol, 1,5-pentanediol, 1,6-hexanediol, 1,8-octanediol, 1,4-cyclohexanedimethanol, 1,3-cyclohexanedimethanol, 2,2-dimethyl-1,3-propanediol, 2,2,4,4-tetramethyl-1,3-cyclobutanediol, diethylene glycol, poly(oxyethylene)glycol, and the like. These end capped, functionalized polyester waxes are readily emulsified with conventional emulsification systems. They may also be coemulsified with oxidized polyethylene or ethylene telomer waxes or with low molecular weight ethylene/acrylic acid copolymer waxes. Such emulsions are useful in floor polishes, for textile treatment and for fruit coating purposes. See col.1, ln.65-col.2, ln.30.

Accordingly, the broad teachings of Joyner et al. appear to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Alternatively, even if the broad teachings of Joyner et al. are not sufficient to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims, it would have been nonetheless obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to arrive at a method for a treatment of textile piece goods by adding end capped polyesters and a textile treatment agent as recited by the instant claims because Joyner et al. teach emulsifiable polyester waxes which are end capped with polyfunctional organic anhydrides useful for textile treatment in general.

8. Claims 18-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miracle et al. (US 5,576,282).

Art Unit: 1751

Miracle et al. teach a method for laundering a fabric employing bleach boosters which increase bleaching effectiveness in lower temperature solutions and demonstrate superior color safety profiles. The bleach boosters are ideally suited for inclusion into bleaching compositions including those with deterative surfactants and enzymes. See abstract.

Miracle et al. teach the utility of polymeric soil release agents. See col.16, ln.65-19, ln.60. Specifically Miracle et al. teach a sulfonated product of a substantially linear ester oligomer comprised of an oligomeric ester backbone of terephthaloyl and oxyalkyleneoxy repeat units and allyl-derived sulfonated terminal moieties covalently attached to the backbone. Such ester oligomers can be prepared by: (a) ethoxylating allyl alcohol; (b) reacting the product of (a) with dimethyl terephthalate ("DMT") and 1,2-propylene glycol ("PG") in a two-stage transesterification/oligomerization procedure; and (c) reacting the product of (b) with sodium metabisulfite in water. Other SRA's include the nonionic end-capped 1,2-propylene/polyoxyethylene terephthalate polyesters. See col17, ln.30-50.

Miracle et al. teach that the bleaching compositions may include various additional ingredients which are desirable in laundry applications. Such ingredients include deterative surfactants, bleach catalysts, builders, chelating agents, enzymes, polymeric soil release agents, brighteners and various other ingredients. Compositions including any of these various additional ingredients preferably have a pH of from about 8 to about 10 in a 1% solution of the bleaching composition. Specifically regarding the deterative surfactant Miracle et al. teach that the deterative surfactant can be nonionic,

anionic, ampholytic, zwitterionic, or cationic. Mixtures of these surfactants can also be used. Preferred detergent compositions comprise anionic deterative surfactants or mixtures of anionic surfactants with other surfactants, especially nonionic surfactants. In example VIII, Miracle et al. teach a laundry detergent composition comprising polyethylene glycol, brightener, polyacrylic acid, and an anionic surfactant as recited by the instant claim. Accordingly, the broad teachings of Miracle et al. appear to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims.

Alternatively, even if the broad teachings of Miracle et al. are not sufficient to anticipate the material limitations of the instant claims, it would have been nonetheless obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, to arrive at a method for a treatment of textile piece goods under conditions which would not favor the formation of transport folds as recited by the instant claims because Miracle et al. teach a method of treating laundry with a laundry detergent composition comprising the same components as recited by the instant claims and further Miracle et al. teach bleaching effectiveness in lower temperature solutions and demonstrate superior color safety profiles.

### ***Conclusion***

9. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Remaining references cited but not relied upon are considered to be cumulative to or less pertinent than those relied upon or discussed above.

10. Applicant is reminded that any evidence to be presented in accordance with 37 CFR 1.131 or 1.132 should be submitted before final rejection in order to be considered timely.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Preeti Kumar whose telephone number is 703-305-0178. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9:00am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Yogendra N. Gupta can be reached on 703-308-4708. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9310 for regular communications and 703-872-9311 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-872-9309.

Preeti Kumar  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1751

PK  
March 23, 2003

  
Mark Kopec  
Primary Examiner